DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 909 EA 013 417

TITLE Formal Evaluation of Certificated Education Staff in Alberta: Practices and Policies. (A Survey Conducted by Alberta Education in 1980).
INSTITUTION Alberta Dept. of Education, Edmonton. Planning and Research Branch.
PUB DATE Sep 80
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Policy Formation; Program Implementation; Questionnaires; Surveys; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Improvement; Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS *Alberta

ABSTRACT

In order to determine current practices and policies concerning the formal evaluation of certified teaching personnel in Alberta, this survey was conducted by means of a questionnaire (appended) sent to all school districts in the province. The findings were then compared to those of a similar survey conducted in 1977. The comparison revealed that more beginning and tenured teachers were evaluated in 1980 than in 1977. The survey also demonstrated that formal evaluations are being increasingly utilized to improve teacher performance. In addition, more districts are using standard evaluation forms than in the past. (WD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED199909

Certificated Education Staff Evaluation

EA 013 417

planning & research

Alberta
EDUCATION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. P. Eddy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FORMAL EVALUATION OF CERTIFICATED EDUCATION STAFF IN ALBERTA: PRACTICES AND POLICIES

(A Survey Conducted by Alberta Education in 1980)

Planning and Research Branch
Alberta Education

September 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	THE PROBLEM	1
	Background	1
	The Alberta Position	1
	Critical Information Needs	1
II.	FINDINGS	3
	Results of 1980 Survey	3
	Comparison of 1977 and 1980 Data	12
	Summary of Findings	16
	APPENDIX	
	1980 Alberta Education Survey Questionnaire and Covering Letter	18

LIST OF TABLES

Number		Page
I	Percentage of Jurisdictions Having Written Policies and Procedures	3
II	Implementation of Written Policies by Jurisdictions	4
III	Percentage of Certificated Staff Formally Evaluated	5
IV	Percentage of Certificated Staff Evaluated During First Year With a Jurisdiction	6
V	Average Number of Staff Evaluations During First Year With a Jurisdiction	7
VI	Frequency of Evaluation of Tenured Staff	8
VII	Percentage of Jurisdictions Using a Standard Evaluation Form	9
VIII	Uses Made of Formal Evaluations	10
IX	Procedures Used in Evaluation	11
X	Average Number of Formal Evaluations of Teachers During Their First Year of Teaching--1977 and 1980	12
XI	Categories of Teachers Formally Evaluated Each Year--1977 and 1980	13
XII	Policies Regarding Frequency of Formal Evaluation of Tenured Teachers--1977 and 1980	14
XIII	Uses Made of Formal Evaluations of Teachers--1977 and 1980	15
XIV	Possession and Use of Standard Forms for Evaluating Teachers--1977 and 1980	16

I. THE PROBLEM

Background

In November 1979 the Canadian Education Association, in cooperation with a number of other educational agencies, held a seminar on inservice and retraining of teachers and administrators. The seminar included representatives of major educational sectors from across Canada and input from political and manpower specialists. Participants were concerned that professional development programs did not clearly relate to the needs of Canadian educators. It was concluded that a major barrier to providing adequate programming was the lack of comprehensive and ongoing evaluation programs of teachers and administrators.

The participants generally considered evaluation of teachers and administrators to occur only in three cases: during the first two years of service in a position, during temporary appointments, or in a crisis situation. In addition, it was their general opinion that termination from a position, rather than improved performance, was the major objective for evaluating teachers and administrators.

The Alberta Position

In January 1980, upon receiving the report of the above-mentioned seminar, Dr. E. K. Hawkesworth, Deputy Minister of Alberta Education, requested a survey be done in Alberta to determine current practices and policies involved in the formal evaluation of certificated education staff.

Since 1970, the primary responsibility for teacher evaluation has rested with local jurisdictions. In the most recent study[1] (Holdaway, 1977) on teacher evaluation practices and policies in Alberta, it was found that 83% of Alberta school systems evaluated all teachers new to the system. This study also found 74% of the systems formally evaluated first year teachers and 47% of all systems had a policy on evaluation frequency. In about 95% of all systems the major use of teacher evaluations was to recommend permanent certification or award a permanent contract. Formal evaluations were also frequently used for dismissal (83%), and promotion (61%). While 64% of Alberta school jurisdictions had a policy on frequency of evaluations of tenured teachers, only 29% of the jurisdictions had standard forms for use in conducting and reporting such evaluations.

The 1977 Alberta study did not examine evaluation practices and policies for other certificated personnel, such as in-school administrators, consultants and supervisors, and central office administrators.

Critical Information Needs

The findings of the Holdaway (1977) study were quite similar to the central conclusions and generalizations of the 1979 C.E.A. Seminar. While the

---

[1] E. A. Holdaway and M. J. Reikie, "Practices and Policies in the Formal Evaluation of Teachers in Alberta," Alberta Education, June 1977.

Holdaway (1977) study dealt with the practices and policies concerning teacher evaluation, it provided no information related to the evaluation of other certificated personnel. Therefore, a broad survey of current practices and policies concerning the formal evaluation of all certificated personnel was a logical undertaking.

If the conclusions of the C.E.A. seminar accurately reflected the evaluation situation for all certificated education staff in Alberta, local school jurisdictions might find it necessary to change their procedures for certificated personnel management.

The survey was conducted by means of a questionnaire which Alberta Education sent to local school jurisdictions. (The questionnaire and covering letter are reproduced in the Appendix of this report.)

This survey attempted to answer the following questions:

1. Is an active policy for teacher evaluation in place in Alberta's local school jurisdictions?

2. Have any changes in teacher evaluation practices and policies occurred since the 1977 study?

3. Is an active policy in place in Alberta's local school jurisdictions for evaluation of other certified personnel, such as in-school administrators, consultants and supervisors, and central office administrators?

The 100 jurisdictions which responded to the survey included: 29 school divisions, 29 counties, 16 separate districts and 26 public districts.

II. FINDINGS

Results of 1980 Survey

This section outlines the findings of the 1980 Alberta Education survey of evaluation policies and procedures.

Table I shows whether or not school systems have written policies and procedures for the evaluation of certificated staff, and Table II shows whether or not these policies are being carried out (as indicated by responses to the questionnaire).

The proportion of jurisdictions having a written policy (Table I) ranged from 44%, for separate districts, to 73%, for public districts. In total, 59% of responding jurisdictions claim a written policy, but only 47% supplied copies of the policy.

Table I

PERCENTAGE OF JURISDICTIONS HAVING WRITTEN POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Type of System	N (Number)	Have Policy	Copy Supplied	Do Not Have Policy
1. School Divisions	(29)	59*	48*	41
2. Counties	(29)	55	45	45
3. Separate Districts	(16)	44	44	56
4. Public Districts	(26)	73	50	27
TOTAL	(100)	59	47	41

* 59% of the divisions (17) claimed written policy but only 48% (14) supplied copies.

As shown in Table II, only 55% of the jurisdictions which had a written policy reported that they actually carried out that policy. Twenty-one percent of jurisdictions reported that they were not carrying out the policy, and 24% did not respond to this question.

Table II

IMPLEMENTATION OF WRITTEN POLICIES BY JURISDICTIONS*

Type of Jurisdiction	Percentage of Jurisdictions Having Policy and Implementation		
	Implemented	Not Implemented	No Response
1. School Divisions	48	28	24
2. Counties	62	21	17
3. Separate Districts	44	19	38
4. Public Districts	62	15	23
TOTAL	55	21	24

* Relate to Table I. For example, 59% of School Divisions claimed written policy and 48% of this group implemented their policy.

The most common explanation given by respondents for not carrying out policy was the use of informal evaluation methods. Written responses also indicated that the superintendent has the major responsibility for ensuring evaluation policies are carried out. It was found, however, that approximately 10% of the jurisdictions assigned this responsibility to other personnel (for the purposes of this survey a "formal evaluation" meant a written report leading to a recommendation or rating which is submitted to the central office of the jurisdiction).

Table III examines which certificated staff are formally evaluated. In total, 45% of the jurisdictions evaluate all of their teaching staff and 3% do not evaluate any teaching staff. While some caution must be exercised in interpreting other categories, particularly the consultant/supervisor category, it is apparent that teaching staff are the primary recipients of evaluation.

Table III

PERCENTAGE OF CERTIFICATED STAFF FORMALLY EVALUATED

Certificated Staff	Type of Jurisdiction				
	School Divisions N=29	Counties N=29	Separate Districts N=16	Public Districts N=26	Total N=100
Teachers:					
- none	0	8	6	0	3
- some	34	38	44	23	34
- most	21	27	12	8	18
- all	45	27	38	69	45
In-School Admin.:					
- none	10	17	31	35	22
- some	41	49	31	35	40
- most	28	10	7	0	12
- all	21	24	31	30	26
Consultants/Supervisors:*					
- none	83	62	76	66	71
- some	7	10	12	19	12
- most	3	10	0	0	4
- all	7	18	12	15	13
Central Office Admin.:					
- none	52	55	63	65	58
- some	21	24	6	12	17
- most	3	4	0	0	2
- all	24	17	31	23	23

* Caution should be observed in interpreting these results. If a jurisdiction had no supervisors or consultants, their response went into the "none" category.

Table IV shows that evaluation of teaching staff occurs primarily during the first year with a jurisdiction.

Table IV

PERCENTAGE OF CERTIFICATED STAFF EVALUATED
DURING FIRST YEAR WITH A JURISDICTION

Certificated Staff	Type of Jurisdiction				
	School Divisions N=29	Counties N=29	Separate Districts N=16	Public Districts N=26	Total N=100
Teachers:					
- first year in teaching	86	90	88	96	91
- first year in system	90	83	81	96	89
In-School Admin.:					
- first year in system	66	62	31	42	54
Consultants/Supervisors:*					
- first year in system	17	30	19	19	22
Central Office Admin.:					
- first year in system	24	24	19	15	21

* Caution should be observed in interpreting these results. (See footnote, Table III.)

Table V indicates the average number of formal evaluations of staff who are in their first year with a jurisdiction. While the majority of certificated staff new to the profession (72%) are evaluated two or more times only 19% are evaluated annually. Evaluation of staff new to the system tends to be nearly equally divided between annually, twice a year, and 3 to 4 evaluations per year.

Table V

AVERAGE NUMBER OF STAFF EVALUATIONS DURING FIRST YEAR WITH A JURISDICTION

Number of Evaluations	Percentage of Jurisdictions				Total
	School Divisions	Counties	Separate Districts	Public Districts	
New to Profession:					
- annually	20	17	19	19	19
- twice	52	31	31	42	40
- 3 or 4	20	48	19	15	27
- 5 or more	7	4	6	4	5
- other*	0	0	25	20	9
New to System:					
- annually	28	21	31	31	27
- twice	38	45	25	35	37
- 3 or 4	31	31	38	35	33
- 5 or more	3	3	0	0	2
- other*	0	0	6	0	1

* Comments such as "as required," "upon request," or "in crisis situations."

Table VI reveals that the frequency of evaluation for tenured staff in all categories is much lower than for non-tenured staff. Of particular interest are the large percentages in the categories labelled "never" or "other." The latter probably means "not on a regular basis."

Table VI

FREQUENCY OF EVALUATION OF TENURED STAFF

Number of Evaluations	Percentage of Jurisdictions				
	School Divisions	Counties	Separate Districts	Public Districts	Total
Teachers:					
- once per year	7	17	6	12	11
- once in 2 years	10	3	0	8	6
- once in 3 years	38	24	31	12	26
- once in 4 years	14	3	13	8	9
- once in 5 or more years	14	10	13	23	15
- other**	17	43	37	37	33
In-School Admin.:					
- once per year	3	14	12	11	10
- once in 2 years	3	3	6	8	5
- once in 3 years	21	10	25	8	15
- once in 4 years	7	3	0	0	3
- once in 5 or more years	7	7	0	4	5
- never	21	24	25	38	27
- other**	38	39	32	31	35
Consultants/Supervisors:*					
- once per year	0	17	12	15	11
- once in 2 years	0	0	0	0	0
- once in 3 years	7	7	6	8	7
- once in 4 years	0	0	0	0	0
- once in 5 or more years	0	0	0	0	0
- never	72	52	56	62	61
- other**	21	24	32	15	21
Central Office Admin.:					
- once per year	28	14	31	11	20
- once in 2 years	3	0	0	4	2
- once in 3 years	7	3	0	4	4
- never	41	55	44	62	51
- other**	21	28	25	19	23

* Caution should be observed in interpreting these results. (See footnote, Table III.)

** Responses such as "rarely," "on demand," "in a crisis," "on-going."

As shown in Table VII, almost one-half of the jurisdictions do not use a standard form for evaluating teaching staff. It is also evident that a minority of jurisdictions employ a standard form for evaluating other certificated staff; for example, 22% use such a form for in-school administrators and 5% use one for consultants and supervisors.

Table VII

PERCENTAGE OF JURISDICTIONS USING A STANDARD EVALUATION FORM

Certificated Staff	Percentage of Jurisdictions				Total
	School Divisions	Counties	Separate Districts	Public Districts	
Teachers:					
- yes	55	38	56	62	52
- no	45	62	44	38	48
In-School Admin.:					
- yes	24	24	25	15	22
- no	76	76	75	85	78
Consultants/Supervisors:					
- yes	7	3	6	4	5
- no	93	97	94	96	95
Central Office Admin.:					
- yes	7	14	19	4	10
- no	93	86	81	96	90

Formal evaluation can be used for a number of purposes. Table VIII lists some of these purposes in declining order of use. Many tentative conclusions could be drawn from this data. For instance, it is interesting to note that when the various uses are ranked, "evaluation for improving performance" ranks first for in-school administrators, consultants/supervisors, and central office administrators, while it ranks third for teachers.

Table VIII

USES MADE OF FORMAL EVALUATIONS

Uses Made of Evaluation	Percentage of Jurisdictions Using				Total	Rank
	School Divisions	Counties	Separate Districts	Public Districts		
Teachers:						
- permanent certification	90	83	88	100	90	1
- permanent contract	90	83	88	100	90	1
- improving performance	90	76	81	85	83	3
- dismissal	69	76	75	92	78	4
- retention in position	55	72	50	85	67	5
- promotions	52	48	50	58	52	6
- transfers	38	48	12	31	35	7
- record of resigning teacher	34	45	19	35	35	7
- record of retiring teacher	24	28	0	27	22	9
In-School Admin.:						
- improving performance	55	55	31	38	47	1
- for permanent contract	62	48	19	27	42	2
- retention in position	45	45	19	35	38	3
- promotions	38	28	38	38	35	4
- dismissal	48	41	12	27	35	4
- transfers	24	28	19	12	21	6
- record of resigning	17	22	6	12	17	7
- permanent certificate	28	17	6	4	15	8
- record of retiring	14	24	0	12	14	9
Consultants/Supervisors:						
- improving performance	17	14	19	27	19	1
- promotions	17	7	19	23	16	2
- permanent contract	24	10	12	12	15	3
- retention in position	17	10	6	15	13	4
- dismissal	14	14	6	15	13	4
- permanent certificate	21	3	12	4	10	6
- improving performance	17	14	19	27	19	7
- record of resigning	7	10	0	8	7	8
- record of retiring	7	7	0	8	6	9
Central Office Admin.:						
- improving performance	17	17	19	15	17	1
- promotions	17	7	12	12	12	2
- retention in position	17	14	12	4	12	2
- dismissal	10	10	12	12	11	4
- for permanent contact	17	10	0	0	8	5
- record of resigning	3	14	0	0	5	6
- permanent certificate	10	3	0	0	4	7
- transfers	3	7	6	0	4	7
- record of retiring	3	7	0	0	3	9

Table IX summarizes the responses to the last four questions on the 1980 survey questionnaire, which examine procedures associated with formal evaluations.

Table IX

PROCEDURES USED IN EVALUATION

Procedures	Percentage of Jurisdictions				
	School Divisions N=29	Counties N=29	Separate Districts N=16	Public Districts N=26	Total N=100
Copy of Evaluation Supplied to Individual Evaluated?					
- yes	76	72	75	85	77
- no	17	14	13	15	15
- no response	7	14	12	0	8
Is Copy of Evaluation Signed by Individual?					
- yes	34	38	50	38	39
- no	52	55	38	62	53
- no response	14	7	12	0	0
What Avenues of Appeal Are Open to Teachers?					
- superintendent	45	55	38	42	46
- board	35	28	13	27	27
- other	14	10	0	0	7
- external evaluator	17	17	19	62	29
- principal consultation	10	7	25	0	9
Formal Written Report After Every Visitation?					
- yes	14	20	19	27	20
- no	76	66	69	73	71
- no response	10	14	12	0	9

Comparison of 1977 and 1980 Data

Because of differences in approach, only certain comparisons can be made between the data collected by Holdaway in 1977[2] and that of the brief 1980 Alberta Education survey. In the following analysis (Tables X to XIV), "1977" refers to the Holdaway study and "1980" refers to the study described herein.

It is notable that 77% of the jurisdictions reported that they provided a copy of the evaluation to the person being evaluated, 15% said they did not provide a copy, and 8% gave no response. In over half of the formal evaluations the person being evaluated did not sign the report.

Table X, which shows the number of formal evaluations during the first year of teaching, reveals a distinct shift to more frequent evaluation. In 1980 72% of beginning teachers were evaluated two or more times, as compared to 53% in 1977. No jurisdictions reported that they did not evaluate beginning teachers in 1980 (although the "other" category could certainly contain teachers who were not formally evaluated).

Table X

AVERAGE NUMBER OF FORMAL EVALUATIONS OF TEACHERS DURING THEIR FIRST YEAR OF TEACHING—1977 AND 1980

Number of Evaluations	Percentage of Jurisdictions								Total	
	School Divisions		Counties		Separate Districts		Public Districts			
	N=30 1977	N=29 1980	N=30 1977	N=29 1980	N=29 1977	N=16 1980	N=25 1977	N=26 1980	N=114 1977	N=100 1980
5 or more	0	7	0	4	0	6	0	4	0	5
3 or 4	23	20	10	48	10	19	16	15	15	27
2	40	52	23	31	45	31	44	42	38	40
1	33	20	57	17	45	19	36	19	43	19
0	3	00	10	0	0	0	4	00	4	0
other*	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	20	0	9

* Comments such as "as required," "upon request," or "in crisis situations."

[2] Holdaway, Op. cit.

Table XI presents the categories of teachers formally evaluated each year. In 1980, no jurisdictions reported not evaluating any teachers, as compared to 4% in 1977. In 1978, an increasing number of tenured teachers, teachers new to the system, and teachers new to teaching were being evaluated on an annual basis.

Table XI

CATEGORIES OF TEACHERS FORMALLY EVALUATED EACH YEAR--1977 AND 1980

Teacher Category	Percentage of Jurisdictions								Total	
	School Divisions		Counties		Separate Districts		Public Districts			
	N=30 1977	N=29 1980	N=30 1977	N=29 1980	N=29 1977	N=16 1980	N=25 1977	N=26 1980	N=114 1977	N=100 1980
All tenured teachers	7	7	3	17	10	6	4	12	6	11
Most teachers	10	N/A	7	N/A	3	N/A	4	N/A	6	N/A
Teachers new to system	83	90	80	83	79	81	92	96	83	89
First year teachers	73	86	70	90	76	88	76	96	74	91
No teachers	0	0	10	0	0	0	4	0	4	0

Table XII presents "frequency of formal evaluation of tenured teachers." This table shows distinct reduction in the "other" category, which usually is chosen when the jurisdiction has no firm practice. In other words, in 1980 there was a general increase in regularity of evaluations.

Table XII

POLICIES REGARDING FREQUENCY OF FORMAL EVALUATION OF TENURED TEACHERS--1977 AND 1980

Policies for Frequencies of of Evaluation of Tenured Teachers	Percentage of Jurisdictions								Total	
	School Divisions		Counties		Separate Districts		Public Districts			
	N=30 1977	N=29 1980	N=30 1977	N=29 1980	N=29 1977	N=16 1980	N=25 1977	N=26 1980	N=114 1977	N=100 1980
Once or more per year	13	7	3	17	3	6	8	12	7	11
Once every 2 years	0	10	13	3	21	0	8	8	11	6
Once every 3 years	33	38	10	24	3	31	20	12	17	26
Once every 4 years or more	13	28	20	13	3	26	12	31	12	24
Other*	40	17	53	43	68	37	52	37	54	33

* Statements such as "on demand," "crisis situations," "rarely," or "other" also includes cases where no response was given.

Table XIII compares the uses made of formal evaluations of teachers in 1977 and 1980. While minor changes have taken place in most categories, the most pronounced shift has occurred in the use of formal evaluations to improve performance. This change occurred in every type of jurisdiction. The total change was from only 18% of jurisdictions reporting this use in 1977 to 83% in 1980.

Table XIII

USES MADE OF FORMAL EVALUATIONS OF TEACHERS--1977 AND 1980

Uses	Percentage of Jurisdictions								Total	
	School Divisions		Counties		Separate Districts		Public Districts			
	N=30 1977	N=29 1980	N=30 1977	N=29 1980	N=29 1977	N=16 1980	N=25 1977	N=26 1980	N=114 1977	N=100 1980
Recommending permanent certification	93	90	97	83	93	88	100	100	96	90
Awarding permanent contract with system	90	90	93	83	93	88	100	100	94	90
Providing basis for dismissal	77	69	87	76	93	75	72	92	83	78
Recording performance of a resigning teacher	37	34	43	45	42	19	44	35	41	35
Providing basis for transfer	37	38	53	48	35	12	36	31	40	35
Improving performance	13	90	7	76	24	81	28	85	18	83
Recording performance of retiring teacher	0	24	0	28	0	0	0	27	0	22
Providing basis for promotion	63	52	60	48	76	50	44	58	61	52
Providing basis for retention in position	0	55	0	72	0	50	0	85	0	67
Providing for teacher reference	3	0	13	0	3	0	8	0	7	0

Table XIV reveals a significant increase in the number of jurisdictions using standard forms in evaluating teacher performance. While only 18% of all jurisdictions reported this practice in 1977 52% reported using standard forms in 1980.

Table XIV

POSSESSION AND USE OF STANDARD FORMS FOR EVALUATING TEACHERS--1977 AND 1980

Percentage of Jurisdictions								Total	
School Divisions		Counties		Separate Districts		Public Districts			
N=30 1977	N=29 1980	N=30 1977	N=29 1980	N=29 1977	N=16 1980	N=25 1977	N=26 1980	N=114 1977	N=100 1980
27	55	20	38	10	56	12	62	18	52

Summary of Findings

1. Of the jurisdictions responding in 1980, 59% reported having a written evaluation policy but only 47% provided copies of their policy.

2. Of the jurisdictions who reported that they had a written evaluation policy, only 55% reported that they carried out that policy. Of the others, 21% reported that the policy was not being implemented and 24% gave no response.

3. Of the responding jurisdictions, 45% reported that they formally evaluate all teaching staff and 3% reported that they do not evaluate any teaching staff.

4. Teaching staff are the primary recipients of formal evaluation; there is a significantly lower rate of evaluation of other certificated staff.

5. Evaluation of teaching staff occurs primarily in the first year with a jurisdiction--90% of staff are evaluated during their first year with a system.

6. The majority (72%) of staff new to the profession are evaluated two or more times during their first year.

7. Tenured staff are evaluated considerably less frequently than are non-tenured staff.

8. Almost one-half of the jurisdictions do not use a standard form for evaluation of certificated staff.

9. In addition to using formal evaluations for making career decisions, such as permanent appointment, promotion, or dismissal, jurisdictions frequently use these evaluations for improving the performance of all categories of certificated staff.

10. Not all jurisdictions provided the person being evaluated with a copy of the written evaluation; 77% of the jurisdictions stated that they did this.

11. The data revealed that beginning teachers were being evaluated more frequently in 1980 than they had been in 1977.

12. In 1980, an increasing number of tenured teachers, teachers new to the system, and teachers new to teaching were being evaluated on an annual basis, as compared to 1977.

13. Between 1977 and 1980 the use of formal evaluations for the purpose of improving performance has dramatically increased. (18% in 1977 and 83% in 1980).

14. In 1977, only 18% of the jurisdictions reported that they used a standard form for evaluating certificated staff, while 52% did so in 1980.

A P P E N D I X

1980 Alberta Education Survey Questionnaire and Covering Letter

Alberta 75

EDUCATION

Devonian Building, West Tower
11160 Jasper Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
T5K 0L2

January 30, 1980

To Alberta School System
Superintendents

Recently the Canadian Education Association, in cooperation with a number of other educational agencies, held a seminar on inservice and retraining of teachers and administrators. The seminar included representation from the major educational sectors across Canada and input from political and manpower specialists.

In the absence of more substantial evidence, seminar participants relied on their perceptions in concluding that few comprehensive personnel development programs for educators exist in Canada and that a major barrier to providing adequate professional development programs for teachers and administrators is the lack of comprehensive ongoing evaluation programs for them. Reinforcement of competent or outstanding teachers appears inadequate. In general, evaluation of teachers and administrators occurs only in the first two years of service in a position, during temporary appointment, or in crisis situations. In the crisis cases data often are not adequate as a basis for decisions on termination. Ad hoc solutions seem to be the order of the day, and too often termination rather than improved performance is the major objective. Except for Quebec, where after two years of successful teaching a teacher has life tenure although not permanent job placement, policies on teacher redundancy generally are of a "last in, first out" nature.

If the situation as outlined pertains in Alberta school systems also, then improvement in personnel management procedures is essential. Until 1970 the province had ongoing evaluation of teachers, with written reports considered an integral part of the teacher personnel file and deposited both locally and in the Registrar's office. Since 1970 the prime responsibility for teacher evaluation has rested with local jurisdictions. A 1977 study conducted by Dr. E.A. Holdaway and Mr. M.J. Reikie of the University of Alberta indicated that a substantial percentage (36%)

of Alberta School jurisdictions had no policy on frequency of evaluations of tenured teachers, and only 29% of jurisdictions had standard forms for use in conducting and reporting such evaluations. There are no more recently collected data on the situation.

The purpose of this letter is to obtain from you an outline of the evaluation policies and procedures followed for all certificated personnel in your school system. A copy of relevant policy and procedures statements, with any attendant forms, would be appreciated. In addition I request that, whether or not you have such statements, you complete and return the attached brief questionnaire, which will facilitate summarizing the current situation in the province.

May I have this information by February 18, 1980 please.

Sincerely,

E.K. Hawkesworth
Deputy Minister of
Education

c.c. Board Chairmen

PROCEDURES FOLLOWED IN FORMAL EVALUATIONS OF CERTIFICATED EDUCATION STAFF

NOTE: A "formal evaluation" means a written report, leading to a recommendation or rating, is submitted to the central office of the jurisdiction.

---

1. Does your jurisdiction have policy and procedures for formal evaluation of certificated education staff:

   A. _____ YES _____ NO (If "YES", please provide a copy with the returned questionnaire.)

   B. If "YES", who has overall responsibility for seeing that the policy and procedures are implemented?

2. If you have answered "YES" to Question #1, is the policy being carried out?

   A. _____ YES _____ NO (If "NO", please explain)

3. What certificated teaching staff are formally evaluated?

4. When are the staff referred to in question 3 evaluated? (NOTE: You may need to check more than one category below.)

	PERSONS EVALUATED			
	CLASSROOM TEACHERS	IN-SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS	CONSULTANTS &/OR SUPERVISORS	CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATORS
NONE				
SOME				
MOST				
ALL				
FIRST YEAR IN TEACHING				
FIRST YEAR IN JURISDICTION				
OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)				

5. On average, how many times are formal evaluations made of staff during their first year with your system when they are:

   a) New to the profession _____ b) New to your system _____

6. On average, how often do you formally evaluate staff who have tenure to your system and serve in the following roles:

ROLE	FREQUENCY OF EVALUATION
CLASSROOM TEACHER	_____
IN-SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR	_____
CONSULTANT &/OR SUPERVISOR	_____
CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATOR	_____

7. Does your school jurisdiction use a standard form for formal evaluations of staff performing the following roles:

CLASSROOM TEACHER	_____ YES	_____ NO	(Where answer is "YES", please provide copies of forms used.)
IN-SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR	_____ YES	_____ NO	
CONSULTANT &/OR SUPERVISOR	_____ YES	_____ NO	
CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATOR	_____ YES	_____ NO	

8. What uses are made of the formal evaluations? (NOTE: you may need to check more than one category below.)

	PERSONS EVALUATED			
	CLASSROOM TEACHERS	IN-SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS	CONSULTANTS &/OR SUPERVISORS	CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATORS
Recommending permanent certification				
Awarding permanent contract with the system				
A basis for improving performance				
Basis for transfer				
Basis for promotion				
Basis for retention in position				
Basis for dismissal				
Retention of record of a teacher who is resigning				
Retention of record of a teacher who is retiring				

9. Is the individual evaluated always supplied with a copy of the evaluation?

_____ YES _____ NO

10. Is the individual evaluated required to sign the evaluation?

_____ YES _____ NO

If "YES", does signing indicate:

_____ Agreement with the evaluation, or

_____ Only that the evaluation has been read by the person evaluated, or

_____ Other (specify)

11. What avenues of appeal are open to a teacher who disagrees with the evaluation of the teachers' own performance?

12. Is a formal report written after every visitation by the person or persons responsible for staff evaluation?

_____ YES _____ NO